Applicant : Ilya Schiller et al.
Serial No. : 09/832,340
Filed : April 10, 2001
Page : 7 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 19965-004001

REMARKS

The comments of the applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the examiner (in small, bold type).

> **4. Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Yamakita, Tooru EP 0 865 192 and further in view of Morishita et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,335,727.**
>
> **Regarding claim 1, Yamakita teaches a method comprising: Receiving handwriting data (writing data on portable terminal) electronically from a remote user at a handwritten-information server (host device) (page 1, column 1), and Processing the handwriting data in accordance with instructions provided to the server by the user (page 1, column 2). However, Yamakita does not explicitly teach the receiving of handwritten-information data on a pen which the data comprise coordinate points.**
>
> **Morishita further teaches a handwriting recognition method further comprises the method of receiving handwritten-information which the data comprises coordinate points representing the handwriting motion (FIG. 5, element 12; FIG. 9, element 12; FIG. 8). Modifying Yamakita's method of processing handwriting according to would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use a pen to capture data on a pen wherein data comprise coordinate points representing the handwriting motion. This would improve processing so that handwriting information can be provided with high portability (column 4, lines 1-5) and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to modify Yamakita according to Morishita.**

Claim 1 has been amended. In contrast to the system in Yamakita (in which the terminal is the primary device and the pen merely a means of providing input to that device,) in claim 1 the handwriting-capturing device receives the handwriting and communicates it to the server through separate communication device. Handwriting collected by the device is automatically sent to the server for processing – that is, for example, it is sent without requiring the user to operate the communication deivce. Eliminating an intermediate user interface like that in Yamakita so that the user can simply write as it is convenient and have the writings acted upon would not have been an obvious extension of a terminal that (like Yamakita) is expected to be the focus of user interaction, even one with pen-based input. Morishita does not add any such feature, as it also contemplates the pen as input to some other "information input device" (col. 10, lines 1-4), not as communicating its input to a server (using the other device merely for communication).

> **Claims 6, 12-13 and 38-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combinafion of Yamakita, Tooru EP 0 865 192 and further in view of Morishita et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,335,727 as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Lee U.S. Patent No. 5,347,477.**

Claims 12 and 49 have been amended and are patentable for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Lee describes a "pressure-sensitive touch panel" device similar to Yamakita and does not remedy the deficiencies of Yamakita identified above.

Claim 13 has been amended. None of Yamakita, Morishita, or Lee describe providing an interface on a device, *independent* of the device which captured the handwriting, *after* the handwriting has been stored on a server. In each case, the device providing the user interface is integrated with the handwriting-capturing function (Yamakita and Lee) or uses the handwriting-capturing function as input (Morishita), thus the device providing the user interface is not independent of the handwriting-capturing device.

New claim 55 has been added. In some examples in the specification, the handwriting-capturing device performs its own handwriting recognition and transmits it directly to a remote server, bypassing the handwriting information server and separate communication device. (See specification, page 11, line 3-5; page 12, lines 5-6.) Yamakita only considers transmitting from the terminal device to the host device (server) and using the host device to implement any instructions accompanying the handwritten information. (See, e.g., ¶¶ 0027-0031.)

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Ilya Schiller et al.
Serial No. : 09/832,340
Filed : April 10, 2001
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 19965-004001

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, reference 19965-004001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1-24-07

Misha K. Hill
Reg. No. 59,737

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21484139.doc